

**VOTE INDIANA TEAM**  
**DRAFT ISSUES AGENDA**  
July 18, 2003

**Statewide Voter File**

**1. Statewide Voter Registration System**

- Guidance for counties needing to replace their voter registration software prior to January 1, 2006.
- Defining the state's role and guidelines in providing costs associated with software, hardware and conversion to the new statewide voter registration system.
  - What will the state pay for? The full package, including the hardware and software and/or replacement hardware?
- Leasing (versus purchasing) of monitors, processors, and CPUs.

**2. Waiver application**

- should Team recommend submission of waiver application for the implementation of the statewide voter registration system to the Federal Election Assistance Commission.

**3. Memorandum of Understanding and county maintenance of effort requirement**

- Defining in the MOU a tie to the county's maintenance of effort

**Voting Equipment**

**1. Leasing issue**

- Whether or not a lease/purchase option for voting systems qualifies for reimbursement.
  - Leasing may need to be an option for some counties due to space restrictions and lack of climate control for storage of certain systems. (3-11-6.5-0.7)

**2. Reimbursement**

- Issue of confusion regarding prior legislation and current legislation concerning reimbursement for voting systems. The real confusion is what happened to the 2001 legislation funds.
  - Prior legislation - In 2001, Indiana established the Voting Systems' Improvements Fund for reimbursement upon application by counties. These funds were allocated to the Build Indiana Fund

which was later diverted to the General Fund by Executive Order to deal with the state's growing budget deficit.

- Current legislation - In 2003, PL209 allows for voting system purchases made since January 1998 to be reimbursed. However, Indiana law is still subject to the limits placed on its use of the federal money by HAVA.
- Reimbursement Issues
  - Use of Section 101 monies for reimbursing Tier B counties for their prior purchases (non accessible equipment they currently use) in addition to the up to \$4000 per precinct amount for accessible machines.
  - Encourage the purchase of more than one machine per precinct (Allen County public comment)
  - Use up to \$6000 per precinct for replacing equipment and use \$2000 for error detection equipment (see comment from GERALYN Miller, submitted to Fort Wayne News Sentinel)
- **The process of reimbursement needs to be defined.**
  - **Application process** – 72 out of 92 already submitted application.
  - Will the money go to all counties at one time?
  - Will there be partial reimbursements and therefore more than one reimbursement payment to each county?
  - Will distribution occur once all applications (or amended applications) are received?
  - What does “first come first serve” mean
    - Does “first-come first-serve” mean for actual purchases and application is submitted or for turning application in first?
    - Should Tier A counties submit certification of accessibility before receiving any Section 102 monies? Could counties self certify for Section 102 monies in 2003 until survey is complete or should there be an independent certification based on the accessible survey?
  - Are there reimbursement monies available for in-person absentee voting operations?
  - Will any reimbursement monies be available for non-voting precincts?
- Future Reimbursement Issues
  - Concerns about future growth and reprecincting prior to January 1, 2006. Will counties be able to receive more money if their number of precincts increase during FY 04 or FY 05?
  - Should the Team reconvene following reprecincting and survey the number of precincts again?
- Should voting systems reimbursement applications also contain a written guarantee from the vendor that it agrees to meet all current and planned state and federal requirements?
- Software reimbursement – counties are eligible in FY 03, but can also receive these funds in FY 04 and 05 – plan needs this clarification.

- Set up Guidelines for exactly what will be reimbursed
  - Operational expenses?
  - Legal expenses?
  - Paper expenses?
  - Interest?

### **3. Accessibility**

- Detail/Procedure of HAVA/State accessibility compliance. How will certification of accessibility be submitted on the application for voting systems reimbursement? (Self certification or independent certification?) Do clerks need to submit proof? If yes, what kind of proof? What about the timing of survey completion?
- Is there a contingency fund and plan to purchase accessible units for counties not in compliance to avoid jeopardizing HAVA dollars?
- **Local advisory council** – define/describe make-up and role of local advisory council

### **4. Waiver application**

- should Team recommend submission of waiver application for the replacement of punch card and lever voting systems to the Federal Election Assistance Commission.

### **5. Memorandum of Understanding and county maintenance of effort requirement**

- Defining in the MOU a tie to the county's maintenance of effort

### **6. Incentives**

- Use of incentives for multi-county purchases or deals made by individual counties for quantity purchases that are made under the cap amount (Tier A=up to \$8000 a precinct and Tier B=up to \$4000 a precinct).
- Should the county be allowed to use the difference (between the plan's recommended amount and the amount spent on voting systems) for other HAVA related expenditures (first-time mail-in registrants, provisional ballots, training and education programs)
- Should there be an incentive for a county negotiating a deal with their voting system vendor for software under the amount in the plan (up to \$50,000 per county) to be eligible also for reimbursement for other local HAVA related expenses?
- If Tier B does not use total \$4000 for accessible voting system, can they keep extra as reimbursement for machine purchased prior to 2000? (This extra reimbursement would have to come from extra 101 monies due to limits on other pots)

### **7. Paper Ballots**

- Should there be some formalized statement about paper ballots being an option to punch card and lever systems if they are not replaced in addition to still requiring an accessible unit for every polling place.

## **8. Grievances**

- Page 23, Description of Official: Suellen Jackson-Boner recommends “The Protection and Advocacy Commission will assist with administering the grievance procedure as it relates to persons with disabilities.”
- See Tom Gallagher’s public comment document for technical changes

### **First-time mail-in registrants**

1. Should the plan define “first-time mail-in registrant”
2. Documentation→ how and who should direct voter registration officials to go about collecting ID documentation from first-time mail-in registrants.

### **Showing Identification at the polls**

1. Should a legislative proposal be submitted regarding all individuals showing identification at the polls
2. Collection of thumb prints in poll list (see Juan Andrade public comment)

### **Other suggested proposals to consider:**

- Voter registration forms should have a carbon copy and an area for the person supplying the registration form to sign.